

## COMMENTS ON THE ECACODE UPDATE

TO: Miles Mayhew, Urban Senior Planner,DPD  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, 98124 E-Mail: [miles.mayhew@seattle.gov](mailto:miles.mayhew@seattle.gov)

FROM: Alexandra Pye,5820 S.W. Hanford, 98116  
E-Mail:[alexandrapye@hotmail.com](mailto:alexandrapye@hotmail.com), Phone: 935-8510

DATE: March 15, 2005

Thanks for getting back to me by phone and letting me know there was a week's extension so I will try an attachment with e-mail, and if that doesn't work, I will mail it and hope it gets to you by the deadline. In any case, it was wonderful to hear a human voice, and someone I had talked with before, that has some history, such as Allen Justad, Tom Hauger, John Skeleton. And what happened to Ken Davis? Anyway, on with my comments:

### IN GENERAL:

Most of the new building that were built on steep slopes, or landslide prone slopes after The Seattle Critical Areas Ordinance of '92 or '94, became affective, did not slide (according to the information I got from the paper, and from the City). In contrast, many of the ones that were built before the Critical Areas Regulations were put into affect did slide. This points out to me that these Critical Areas Regulations were effective in preventing slides. This is particularly important to me as I was on the ECA Advisory Committee, with Cliff Marks as the Lead person from DCLU, along with Vivian McLean, Randy Spann and many others. Randy still believes that the more cement one puts on steep slopes the more stable the hill is. BALONEY!

Therefore, In general, I think that the regulations should not change. However, I do realize the pressure of the Developers and the many of the Land Owners who believe that if I can't do what I want on my land, then it is a "taking" and I must be paid market rate by government for the "taking". Thus you probably had to tweak the '90's regulations some. Nevertheless, my comments just state my goals for our land, with more development happening. So here goes:

### WETLANDS:

I support the proposed increase in wetlands buffer for Categories I,II,III, but object to allowing option for lowering buffer for the small projects in Category IV, "May be allowed" because owners could take advantage of this without enforcement by the City. How can this be prevented?

## FISH AND WILDLIFE:

The proposed regulations are fine unless a Mayor is elected that is not supportive of the Species Habitat Plan. The Director better follow what the Mayor wants, or he or she could be out of a job (unless it can wiggle his way around what the Mayor wants). The Mayor has great power in the City, as he appoints all the Department heads. What is the safeguard here to protect the Species Habitat Plan and the Endangered Species Act (or in Seattle's case, THE SALMON)?

## REPARIAN CORRIDORS

In general, I support the proposed amendments to Class A and B Riparian Corridors. For existing lots, amendments indicate that "some buffer reductions may be allowed from 50' to 25'. Is this for new development? Although I understand why it is stated, I wonder if it will not add to overdevelopment close to the water, adding more pollution and adding to the loss of salmon? Is there plan for mitigation or some compensation to the new land owner that does not want to build 50' away from the stream so that the stream is not more polluted with new construction and more people?

## LANDSLIDE PRONE AREAS

Since I believe that changes in land use affect a whole community, not just the people 100' on either side, I am very much against eliminating notification altogether. Therefore, I would hope the current regulations and code would stand as it is regarding notification to surrounding property owners. What does a 15% slope look like and why should that provision be eliminated?

## STEEP SLOPES

What is the difference, relating to slides, in the current regulations stating that "development is limited to 30% of the steep slope area" and the proposed to "allow a variance to allow a maximum 30% of the steep slope area?" Will this increase the size of the building over the land, and thus more disturbance to the land, with more slides?"

I certainly support exemptions to existing developments, steep slope created by LEGAL grading activities (Randy Spann did his illegally on Jacobsen Road near Beach Drive and got away with it as he knows the regulations very well, and the City did not want to be sued). Regarding the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet of exemptions. see my comments about the power of the Director in the Fish and Wildlife section, as it applies here, also.

I oppose exempting subdivision, downtown areas from the steep slope regulations. Why should these areas have be allowed more exemptions than other areas?. This is

giving special favors to downtown areas and to subdevelopment. It is; not just or fair to the rest of us. I also oppose the small slope waiver.

In general, when these exceptions are made, it can give a precedent on doing more good regulations for steep slopes, and in general endangering our land with the increase in buildings, cement, etc. It can set a precedent. Who is to hold the City back? Hopefully it is the Citizens, but the balance may weigh more heavily on Political power.

## TREES AND VEGETATION

Why is the tree and vegetation removal permit recommended to be removed? I see the reasoning to some degree, with a requirement for a tree and revegetation plan . However, how is this requirement to be known about and enforced?

In general, though, Miles, I see the recommendations for proposed changes have gone through much thought, discussion by the City and input from others. However, I wish I had had a chance to discuss some of my reservations about the changes with you. At the same time, I do appreciate your extension of the deadline.

Sincerely

Alexandra Pye